THE MEANINGFULNESS OF SORTS IN THE CREATION OF CONSTRUCTS

By

DANIEL MURRAY PHILIP

A DISSERTATION PRESENTED TO THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

2003

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First, I would like to thank my parents, Jean and Annette Philip, for a list of things that defy cataloguing. Beyond parental "duties," beyond motivation, beyond helping me find myself -- I cannot thank them enough for everything and, not surprisingly, I cannot begin to explain that for which I am thanking them.

I would also like to thank all of the good friends who have come, gone, and/or stayed in my life. In particular, I owe a debt of gratitude to Randy Gerlick, Jeff Welt, Rafi Katz, Sherri Zack, Sherri Feiner, Louis Wynn, Tara Hamer, Jennifer Grossman, Melinda Seigel, and Jennifer Youmans. In graduate school, where would I have been without Cory Wallack, Kelly Burton, and Kevin and Jen Stanley? All of them have pulled me from the fire more times than I care to remember and certainly more times than I let them know. Irrespective of where we are in these relationships currently, all of their marks are indelibly etched on my soul.

Next, I want to thank the multitude of teachers I had throughout my education through high school. I want to

extend special thanks to Bill Vogel, Bunny Blattner, Linda Winrow, Carol Greener, Pat Smith, and Bob Parsons. These teachers, in particular, helped me hone in on what I enjoyed and what I found energizing, as well as kept me at least remotely on track when I, so often, would become derailed.

As for my collegiate career, where to begin? Well, I want to thank Robin West for listening to the truth and not ending my collegiate career before it had barely begun. I want to thank Jim Archer for acting as an excellent advisor during my work in the counselor education program -- our discussions about the overall field of therapy (and the interdisciplinary rifts), among a host of other topics, were more helpful than you know. Other thanks in the Counselor Education Department go out to Pete Sherrard, Ellen Amatea, Max Parker, and Larry Loesch for their respective influences. Further, I want to extend a special thank you to Candy Spires for being a wonderful person and link to resources, both during my tenure in the Counselor Education Department and after my "defection."

In the Psychology Department, the list could be endless so I shall try to keep it brief. I would like to thank Marty Heesacker for significant help in learning about the area of counseling psychology and what it took to

succeed in the counseling psychology program at UF, both prior to and during my graduate work there. I also want to thank Harry Grater; he influenced my ideas and beliefs about therapy as much as, if not more than, anyone. A special thank you goes out to Ces Bibby, Sarah Lee, and Viki Solt. They helped me with and bailed me out of countless situations; their hard work does not go unnoticed or unappreciated, though I know it often seems that way.

As for training, I would like to extend a "longevity" thank you to Nancy Coleman who has seen my work from neophyte therapist to marginally more than a neophyte therapist. I also want to thank Jim Morgan for letting me find my own space in therapy, even though he does have a voice and presence that makes Charlton Heston sound like Pee Wee Herman. A huge thank you is also in order to Mike Herkov for all of his help with assessment and interventions as well as with issues of professional development.

I would like to thank the entire staff at the Appalachian State University Counseling and Psychological Services Center for all of their help during this process. I would especially like to acknowledge Jennie Cassidy, Rafael Harris, Sammie Hartley, Lisa Owens-Hennick, and Scott Sokoloski. Their support over the past few weeks,

let alone over the past several months, has helped immeasurably.

I would also like to thank Bob Ziller and Pete Giacobbi for being part of my doctoral committee. In particular, I want to thank them for being available for so many different purposes: master's project, planned program, qualifying exams, dissertation proposal, and dissertation defense. Their help has been integral. I would also like to acknowledge my two research assistants, Sheryl Rosenthal and Morgan Sprosty, for the multitude of tasks they executed over the course of this project.

I would like to thank Greg Neimeyer for the host of roles that he has played during my graduate work at UF. From professor to "unofficial chair" and so many places in between, his influence has been steady and steadying. I especially appreciated the opportunity to work with him on committees during the 2001-2002 academic year, and his help with my research has literally been invaluable.

Where do I begin to thank Franz? It sounds corny, but I cannot believe that I first met him as a greener than green undergraduate, taking his Psychology of Personality course in the Fall of 1989. Over the past 14 years, he has been such a consistent influence for me, even during the four years that I spent working between undergraduate and

graduate school. Theory, therapy, professional development, ethics, diversity, personal development -- he has helped me with all of these and more. I do not think he understands how important a person he is to me, and I could never overestimate the appreciation I have for him. His influence pervades what I do and how I do it, and for that I am forever grateful.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

page

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS ii

ABSTRACT viii

CHAPTER

1 INTRODUCTION..... 1

2 REVIEW OF LITERATURE..... 8

3 METHODS..... 33

Participants..... 33
Instruments..... 33
Procedure..... 35

4 RESULTS..... 37

5 DISCUSSION..... 39

APPENDIX

A CATEGORIES OF ELEMENTS FROM KELLY'S EXAMPLE PROTOCOL..... 48

B INSTRUCTIONS FOR GRID 1..... 49

C INSTRUCTIONS FOR GRID 2..... 51

D ROLE TITLE LIST..... 53

E ROLE CONSTRUCT REPERTORY INVENTORY, GRID VERSION 1.. 56

F ROLE CONSTRUCT REPERTORY INVENTORY, GRID VERSION 2.. 58

REFERENCES 59

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH 65

Abstract of Dissertation Presented to the Graduate School of the University of Florida in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

THE MEANINGFULNESS OF SORTS IN THE CREATION OF CONSTRUCTS

By

Daniel Murray Philip

August 2003

Chair: Franz Epting
Major Department: Psychology

Though a significant amount of methodological research has been conducted on George Kelly's Role Construct Repertory Inventory, no known research has been conducted on the importance of sorts in construct elicitation. Extending Philip's work, this study investigated the meaningfulness of sorts in construct creation. Specifically, four subgroups of elements (Family, Intimate, Acquaintance, and Figure) were used in sort composition. In keeping with prior research as well as the work of Erikson and Vygotsky, primary hypotheses included a significant difference between sorts from Intimate and Figure groups as well as Acquaintance and Figure groups, though analyses of two repeated measure designs did not yield significant results. An additional analysis between

meaning ratings and FIC scores yielded a negative correlation, contrary to hypothesis. Discussion of results centers on construct theory and methodology, and future avenues of research are indicated.

CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this dissertation is to extend the current level of knowledge regarding a specific area of methodology relating to the Role Construct Repertory Inventory (RCRI) (Kelly, 1955), often known in the discipline of psychology as the Repgrid (Neimeyer, Neimeyer, Hagans, & Van Brunt, 2002). In particular, this study investigated the meaningfulness of sorts in the creation of constructs elicited from Repgrid administration. The study represents both a replication and an extension of previous research conducted in the field.

The basis of this study involved examining the Repgrid, a tool used for psychological assessment put forth by George A. Kelly in his watershed work on personality theory, *The Psychology of Personal Constructs* (1955). As Personal Construct Psychology and the field of Constructivism in general become more widely accepted and applied (Neimeyer & Mahoney, 1995), there are those in the discipline of psychology who utilize Kelly's Repgrid with little or no knowledge of the theoretical underpinnings

(Bannister, 1985). Though the repgrid is likely Kelly's most widely accepted and acknowledged contribution to date, it is nonetheless true that it is a complex and recondite instrument subject to a wide variety of influences and effects (Neimeyer et al., 2002).

While there has been a significant amount of research conducted regarding potential variations in repgrid technique (Neimeyer et al., 2002), little research has focused on the importance of the "elements" (Kelly, 1955, p. 224) or "sorts" (Kelly, 1955, p. 222) involved in construct elicitation. An element is a figure (e.g., person), concept (e.g., clinical disorder), or entity (e.g., social role) known to the participant; a sort is a grouping of elements (Kelly, 1955). The current study seeks to replicate and extend the general findings of previous research by including a greater quantity of elements, element subgroups, and sorts.

With regard to the use of elements, Mitsos (1958) investigated the issue of representativeness of elements by asking participants to complete either a Role Title List including 19 roles or a second list where they were asked to list the names of 19 friends. Mistos' (1958) results indicated a broader set of elements (consistent with the

first group of participants) produced more meaningful, superordinate constructs, supporting the issue of representativeness of elements comprised in a Role Title List.

Further, though adaptations of element sets have been conducted to some extent by a number of individuals in the field of constructivism (Winter, 1992), the consequences of these modifications have received little attention. Stringer (1979) conducted research focused on the elicitation of constructs with two different element sets: one utilizing the names of individuals derived from role titles, the second employing only the role titles. Stringer postulated that less complex and less differentiated constructs would result from the use of the role titles as elements and results of his study supported this hypothesis (Stringer, 1979).

While there have been few studies examining the salience of elements on the elicitation of constructs, I could not find any research that probed into the prominence of sorts on construct elicitation. Even Kelly (1955) himself spends a paucity of time explaining his reasons for their creation, and his attention to sorts is somewhat confusing; he suggests 32 sorts for the Role Construct

Repertory test (see Table 1, p. 223) while later expounding upon 22 of the sorts in a section entitled "Rationale of Titles and Sorts" (p 273). Kelly does more in the way of explaining the sorts via their elements than the reasons upon which they were configured as such, with 16 of the 22 explanations representing essentially descriptions of the component elements.

My master's study (Philip, 2001) investigated the importance of sorts in the elicitation procedure. Given the multitude of possible permutations from 22 elements, the study focused on a significantly restricted number of sorts and component elements. Specifically, three groups of four elements, using Kelly's original theoretical conceptualization as a starting point, were advanced: Family, Acquaintance, and Figure.

In the previous study (Philip, 2001), I posited that sorts from the Family group would be rated as more meaningful than sorts from either the Acquaintance or Figure groups. Results did not support this hypothesis, with the mean score from the Acquaintance element group yielding significantly more meaningful constructs than the mean score from the Figure group (Philip, 2001). In addition, though not reaching the level of significance,

the mean score for the Acquaintance group was greater than the mean score for Family (Philip, 2001).

The results of the previous study yield a particular interpretation regarding the Acquaintance group producing more meaningful constructs. Many classic works in psychology have focused on developmental stages through which individuals are theorized to progress. Specifically, the works of Erik Erikson and Lev Vygotsky address development across the lifespan that apply to the aforementioned results.

Vygotsky (1987) emphasized the importance of socio-cultural influences in cognitive development, more so than contemporaries such as Jean Piaget (Kitchener, 1996). According to Erikson, young adults are embroiled in a conflict between intimacy and isolation, and must effectively establish social and romantic relations with peers or face isolation (Erikson, 1985). These views underscore the importance of peer relations in young adults' lives, and research supports the view that peers exert significant influence on young adults (Holbrook & Caskey, 2000; Wigfield, Eccles, & Pintrich, 1996). When considering that the population to be sampled for the current study is comprised of college students, such works

provide important insight into the pre-eminence of the influence of peer groups on young adults.

The current study looks to replicate as well as extend the findings of the previous study. The previous three element sets, Family, Acquaintance, and Figure, remain with a fourth element group, Intimates, added to the elicitation. The Intimate element group was comprised of the roles of Current Partner, Ex-Partner, Current Best Friend, and Ex-Best Friend. These roles map to the roles Kelly (1955) posited for a subgroup of elements of the same name (Spouse, Ex-Flame, Pal, and Ex-Pal, respectively). The Intimate group is included due to the level of interpersonal attachment associated with these roles as well as Kelly's view that elements from this category can elicit varying constructs (Kelly, 1955). As Bell, Vince, and Costigan (1999) intimate, alterations in element sets can have a substantial impact on eliciting an individual's construct system.

Further, the centrality of the issue of meaningfulness to this study warrants investigation as to its link to other measures of meaningfulness. In the realm of constructivism, one primary indication of meaningfulness involves the concepts of cognitive complexity (Bieri, 1955)

and functionally independent constructs (Landfield, 1971). Consequently, these issues will be addressed in their relation to the current study's measure of meaningfulness as well as to constructivist theory.

CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Kelly presents the concept of sorts via the elicitation of constructs. Constructs are bipolar, dichotomous variables that each individual creates in order to make meaning out of and attempt to anticipate occurrences in the surrounding world (Kelly, 1955). Each person has a finite yet extensive number of constructs that are connected in a complex and multidimensional fashion. They are arranged in a hierarchical manner, with some constructs being more central or important (superordinate) and some being less central or important (subordinate). For Kelly, a person's system of constructs represents the primary mode of meaning making for that individual. In using the Repgrid, the combination of elements as a sort represents the means by which constructs are elicited.

In his masterwork, Kelly (1955) introduces his notion of sorts by explaining their component parts. These components, or elements, are the names of individuals a participant nominates from the roles provided in the "Role Title List" (p. 220). The Role Title List is comprised of descriptions of roles of people that are likely to occur in

the participant's life (e.g., your father, or the person who has played the part of a father in your life). When completing the Role Title List, each participant is asked "to respond to the list by designating, by name or otherwise, the personal identities of the people in his [her] own realm of experience who fit the role titles" (Kelly, 1955, p. 220). In other words, participants are asked to produce names (or descriptions, if the participant does not know the name of the person) of people in their life that represent the roles specified.

However, Kelly's references to elements and sorts can, at times, be confusing. Early in his description of the RCRI, he describes 24 elements as being "the role titles in a current form of the test" (Kelly, 1995, pp. 220-2). In another portion of the same chapter he nominates 22 elements (Kelly, 1955, p. 274). Though there is substantial overlap among the two element sets (11 identical and 2 similar elements), there remain 20 elements that diverge. While somewhat perplexing, the occurrence of two separate yet related element sets does not invalidate the use of elements. It does, however, underscore the wealth of variations among element sets that may be employed.

As previously indicated, Kelly himself spends little time explaining his rationale for the nomination of sorts, providing even marginal explanation for only 6 of the 22 sorts he nominates in his "Rationale of Titles and Sorts" (1955, p. 273). In listing the 22 elements that compose the sample protocol included as a demonstration of the Repgrid, Kelly catalogs the elements into distinct sets (see Appendix I); these groupings play a role in the six sorts where a more delineated rationale is offered.

For example, the Intimacy sort is composed of the elements of Spouse (or partner, for those who are not married), Ex-Flame (person who represents your last significant partner), and Pal (very good friend) and contains elements only from the Intimates grouping of elements (Kelly, 1955). Kelly proffers that this sort "tends to bring out features of personal conflict, both between the client's attitude toward two intimate figures of the opposite sex and also between and intimate figure of the opposite sex and an intimate figure of the same sex" (1955, p. 275). Similar explanations are offered for the Valence, Family, Need, Compensatory, and Identification Sorts. However, Kelly spends minimal attention to the issue of sorts beyond these abbreviated explanations.

After a participant completed the Role Title List, Kelly presented the sorts to the participants via the classic method of elicitation, the "triadic difference method" (Epting, Suchman, & Nickeson, 1971). In this elicitation procedure, the person is asked to consider sorts, one at a time, from the elements derived from the Role Title List. Starting with the first sort, the participant is asked to think about the three people comprising each sort and generate some way in which two of the people are alike and, at the same time, different from the third person (Epting, 1984). The remaining sorts are approached in the same manner.

As its name indicates, the triadic difference method (Epting et al., 1971) involves the use of three elements in a sort. This form of elicitation results from Kelly's "Construction Corollary" (Kelly, 1955, p. 50) whereby he refers to the minimum context necessary for construct elicitation. Minimum context "refers to the assumption that construing requires the identification of perceived similarity between two or more events in a way that distinguishes them from at least one other event" (Neimeyer et al., 2002). Consequently, the minimum number of elements that can comprise a sort is three. The idea that the

minimum context applies to the creation of a new construct, not to the educing of existing constructs, has been advanced (Fransella & Bannister, 1977) though there is no published research to support this contention currently.

Within the realm of construct elicitation, there are several potential elicitation variations. The first is borne of the Construction Corollary and is related to the number of elements involved in the construction process. In construct elicitation, "context variations" (Neimeyer et al., 2002, p. 177) of monadic, dyadic, and triadic methods of elicitation have been utilized. In the monadic process of elicitation, constructs are elicited from a single object or element at a time (Epting, Probert, & Pittman, 1993). Such a procedure does not require an overt contrast during the construct development, with each characteristic serving as the explicit or emergent pole of the construct (Neimeyer et al., 2002). Participants are then asked to name the opposite of each characteristic (see "Opposite Method," below) to form the implicit or imergent pole of each dimension (Leitner, 1985). Monadic procedures have generally been used for eliciting constructs about the self (Leitner, 1985; Landfield, Stefan, and Dempsey, 1990) with indications that this procedure generates more meaningful

self-constructions than the triadic procedure (Leitner, 1985).

Dyadic elicitation procedures encourage the participant to reflect on the similarities or differences between only two elements (Neimeyer et al., 2002). The dyadic elicitation method has one distinct advantage over the triadic method -- when a participant perceives all three elements as similar. The dyadic elicitation method addresses this dilemma by allowing the participant to report *either* a similarity *or* a difference, without placing the additional constraint that the contrast pole applies to either of the elements (Landfield, 1971).

Caputi and Reddy (1999), in their study of 24 postgraduate psychology students, provided the first empirical comparison of dyadic and triadic methods of elicitation. Each participant completed one of two repertory grids using a common set of eight elements. One grid used 12 constructs elicited through the dyadic procedure while the other grid used 12 constructs elicited through the triadic procedure. Results indicated that the triadic method generated constructs that were more cognitively complex (Caputi & Reddy, 1999), a concept that I will address later in this text.

Another variation in construct elicitation procedures involves the set of instructions given to the participant. This "instructional set" (Neimeyer et al., 2002) has classically followed the difference method as outlined by Kelly (1955). In this method, participants are asked to identify how any two people in a (three-person) sort are alike in some way yet different from the third person, and use this distinction as the basis for the construct. However, Epting et al. (1971) suggested an alternate instructional set based on a variation indicated by Kelly (1955), nominating a procedure where participants were requested to identify how any two of three elements were alike, then to indicate the opposite of that term. Compared with the original difference method, Epting et al. (1971) found that the opposite method increased the bipolarity of participants' constructs by eliciting fewer "bent" (non-antonym) constructs.

Following up on the work of Epting et al. (1971), Hagans, Neimeyer, and Gooodholm (2000) conducted a study involving instructional set variations with undergraduate college students. Results from this mixed factorial design showed that the difference method yielded significantly higher levels of construct differentiation as well as less

socially undesirable contrast poles than the opposite method. Hagans et al. (2000) proposed two added ways in which use of the opposite vs. difference method affects the nature of the elicited constructs. Encouraging participants to produce an opposite, they suggest, would seem to induce more extreme contrasts. Instructions for the difference method, however, "could invite less extreme characterizations" (Neimeyer et al., 2002, p. 182). Further, the opposite method allows the participant to nominate a concept for the contrast pole that may not apply to any element on the grid; this is not a possibility via the difference method (Hagans et al., 2000). Given the research on instructional and contextual sets, the triadic difference method was utilized in the current study.

In addition to variations in instructional and contextual sets, variations in element sets have also been utilized to varying degrees in construct elicitation. In modifying element sets for use in the Role Title List, the issue of representativeness becomes prominent (Fransella, 1995). The third of Kelly's "Assumptions Underlying the Rep Test" (1955, p. 230) indicates that the people included in the Role Title List must be individuals that are "sufficiently representative" (p. 230) of important people

in the participant's life as well as people about whom the participant has formed important constructs. Kelly does not specify the manner in which this representativeness of elements should be accomplished other than to stress the significance of sampling from a wide range of roles in a person's life in the service of striving for such representativeness. Similarly, Fransella and Bannister (1977) indicate that elements should be "chosen to represent the area in which construing is to be investigated" (p. 11) and, in keeping with Kelly's (1955) formulations, such sampling should represent a wide range of potential candidates from among the element field.

In most conventional studies, individuals known to the participant usually comprise the element field and are intended to fit specific role titles. However, Fransella and Bannister (1977) advise that the elements chosen for investigation are not required to represent individuals. Greg Neimeyer, in association with a variety of colleagues, has investigated the use of occupational titles as elements in the elicitation of constructs (Moore & Neimeyer, 1997; Moore & Neimeyer, 1992; Moore, Neimeyer, & Marmarosh, 1992; Neimeyer, Leso, Marmarosh, Prichard, & Moore, 1992; Metzler & Neimeyer, 1988). Other adaptations of elements to fit

specific topic areas include social roles, different aspects of self, forms of therapy, and areas of social consciousness (Winter, 1992). Though, the effects of these variations have not generally been scrutinized and, as indicated above, the predominant use of element sets in construct elicitation has been of roles of individuals salient to the participant. This is also consistent with the element sets used in this study.

A further variation on element sets involves the issue of element valence, a term which denotes how the roles in the Role Title List are perceived by the participant: positive, negative, or neutral/mixed (Neimeyer et al., 2002). The issue of element valence can have a significant effect on the elicitation of constructs, specifically on construct differentiation. Differentiation refers to the level of dependence between constructs; greater differentiation corresponds to greater independence amongst constructs elicited at the same administration (Fransella & Bannister, 1977). Research indicates that negatively valenced elements elicit more differentiated constructs (Parr & Neimeyer, 1994). Consequently, researchers have suggested that variations in the elements comprising element sets may have a distinct outcome on aspects of

construct elicitation (Neimeyer et al., 2002). As such, each of the element sets in this study contains at least one negatively valenced role title.

With respect to the representativeness of elements, Spiro Mistos' work is of the earliest on record. In his work on the RCRI, Mitsos (1958) investigated the importance of the representativeness of elements in Repgrid use and construct elicitation. Specifically, he explored the following statement:

> If the test is to indicate how the subject develops his role in the light of his understanding of other people, it is necessary that the other people appearing as elements in the test be sufficiently representative of all the people with whom the subject must relate his self construed role. (Kelly, 1955, p. 230)

Hence, Mitsos set out to test the idea that "representative elements (representative role titles) are necessary to elicit the most crucial personal constructs" (1958, p. 311). In his study, two groups of participants were administered the Repgrid. One group of participants was provided a role title list consisting of 19 role titles, a heterogeneous sample of people known to the individual; the other group was asked to list the names of 19 personal friends, a more homogeneous sample of people known to the participant. Results indicated that

constructs elicited from a heterogeneous sample of roles yielded more consistent and superordinate constructs. Consequently, heterogeneous role titles were chosen for this study.

In a similar light, Stringer (1979) investigated an adaptation of element sets used for construct elicitation. Specifically, he examined the importance of role titles in the process of construct derivation. This query was born out of inconsistencies in methodology of different researchers; some instructions asked only for participants only to nominate names of familiar people, others used various manipulations of providing a Role Title List and requesting participants to assign names of familiar people that fit such roles, and still others required participants to use the role title list without nominating names (Stringer, 1979).

As evidenced above, Mistos' (1958) investigation indicated that using a Role Title List provided more consistent and superordinate constructs. In a related but distinct manipulation, Stringer's research utilized two different element sets: one employing the names of individuals derived from role titles, the second employing only the role titles (1979). Stringer used the same

participants for both grid elicitations, with a one-day interval between administrations. Further, Stringer (1979) varied the order of administration by halving the pool of participants (i.e., one half of the participant group completed grids with role titles only first, the second half completed grids with names from role titles; then the order of administration was reversed).

Stringer's results indicated "different forms of the grid … do not elicit the same kinds of construing" (1979, p. 99). Similar to Mistos, he also found that constructs elicited from names derived from role titles were more consistent and superordinate than those elicited from the role titles themselves. To explain this finding, Stringer hypothesized that "role construing is less of an ongoing process than the construing of individuals, and that the constructs are less readily available" (1979, p. 99). In consideration of these findings, the names derived from the role titles were utilized in this study during sort construction and construct elicitation.

As mentioned above, the issue of cognitive complexity is very salient in construct elicitation. Bieri (1955) introduced the concept of cognitive complexity as the relative number of different meaning dimensions that are

available to a person, with dimensions of meaning likened to personal constructs. The number of different meaning dimensions that a person's construct system supports should provide an indication of the ability produce alternative interpretations of a situation, as a personal construct system is composed of a finite number of constructs. For Bieri (1955), the primary focus of constructs was inherently akin to Kelly's (1955): for prediction of occurrences in our environment. As he explains,

> Inasmuch as constructs represent differential perceptions or discriminations of the environment, it would be expected that the greater the degree of differentiation among the constructs, the greater will be the predictive power of the individual. In other words, there should be a positive relationship between how well an individual's system of constructs differentiates people in the environment and how well the individual can predict the behavior of these people. (Bieri, 1955, p. 263)

Therefore, a construct system composed of many constructs would allow the individual to generate an ample variety of different constructions for translating and gauging experience. A more rudimentary or simple system of constructs, however, would limit the individual to relatively few perspectives. The former example is one of a cognitively complex construct system; the latter, a cognitively simple system. Such a distinction is the basic value of a system with greater cognitive complexity or

level of differentiation; greater access to making sense of or deriving meaning from one's environment (Neimeyer et al., 2002). As authors in the field have indicated, the issue of differentiation or cognitive complexity has resulted in a substantial research base over the course of nearly the last half-century (Neimeyer et al., 2002; Adams-Webber, 1998).

As the research base on cognitive complexity has grown, one of the basic tenets has involved the relationship between meaningfulness and cognitive complexity. Specifically, meaningfulness and cognitive complexity have been theorized as being functionally related (Bieri, 1961), and research has supported this contention (Neimeyer & Neimeyer, 2002). In the realm of constructivism, cognitive complexity has primarily been associated with Landfield's (1971) idea of Functionally Independent Constructs (FIC). Though Landfield himself "avoided designating [the] organizational score as a measure of cognitive complexity" (1971, p. 15), he indicated the desire to avoid valence judgments as to the issue of direction (high and low) as well as the term complexity.

FIC are defined as, "the number of functionally different dimensional units of meaning inferred from a Rep Test grid" (Landfield, 1971, p. 14). A high FIC score relates to greater independence amongst constructs, while a low score represents greater interdependence amongst constructs. In other words, a person with a high level of cognitive complexity would use many disparate constructs while a cognitively simple person would use dimensions of experience that are very interrelated (Landfield, 1971).

From this view, the concepts of cognitive complexity and meaningfulness have been related with functionally independent constructs acting as the intermediate variable. In particular, FIC scores have been utilized as a measure of cognitive complexity. Related to construct elicitation, FIC is conceptualized as the total number of separate constructs used by a participant on a specific Repgrid administration (Landfield, 1971).

For the purposes of FIC calculation, constructs and elements are analyzed by their component ratings. Put in other terms, they are seen as a profile of the ratings that participants give them (Landfield, 1971). As an example, we will consider a six (sorts) by six (elements) RCRI. If two constructs of the resultant constructs had the exact

same ratings [for example the ratings (3 -3 2 0 -2 -1)] for the six elements, those constructs would be considered functionally similar; the same would hold true if two elements had the same ratings across constructs. Consequently, FIC scores were calculated for later analysis in the current study.

With respect to the different individuals contained within the element set of this study, I drew upon the works of Erik Erikson and Lev Vygotsky. In his work on human psychological development, Erikson put forth the idea that life was organized into eight developmental stages that span an individual's life, from birth through death (Gross, Jr, 1987). Erikson's work was seminal in that it extended individual development past childhood, a focus few of his contemporaries in human development had addressed (Kitchener, 1996). Specifically, Erikson accounted for adolescent and adult development starting with the 5th stage of his theory.

In his writings, Erikson organized his developmental stages according to an underlying conflict that the individual must negotiate successfully in order for proper ego development to occur (Welchman, 2000). Similar to Kelly, Erikson conceptualized these conflicts in terms of

dichotomous pairs; one might think of him- or herself as being outgoing or introverted, optimistic or pessimistic, open- or close-minded. For the purposes of this study, I am specifically interested in Erikson's 5th and 6th stages of development.

The 5th stage of ego development in Erikson's theory is associated with adolescence (age 12-18). In this stage, the principal conflict involves Identity versus Role Confusion (Erikson, 1985). Erikson recognizes that life becomes more complex for the individual as s/he begins to learn to negotiate the demands of oncoming adulthood. The individual strives to fashion his or her identity and sense of morality while learning to assimilate into society and navigate the difficult world of complex, social interactions (Erikson, 1985).

For Erikson, the charge in this stage is to forge our identity as individuals, integrating both concepts from our upbringing and society as well as aspects distinct from these institutions (Gross, Jr., 1987). Such integration involves incorporating values, interests, and abilities in addition to the messages we receive from family, community, and society about our beliefs (Langford, 1995). This process can be excruciatingly difficult and many people

enter a period of withdrawal from others or responsibilities during this process, a period Erikson referred to as a moratorium (Erikson, 1985). Successful navigation of this stage results in the early, well-formed aspects of one's identity; lack of success results in confusion about one's self, one's role in the larger context and, quite often, personal turmoil (Erikson, 1985).

For the purposes of this study, the 5th stage is particularly important for two reasons. First, many of the participants are of an age at or in close proximity to the end of age range for this stage. Second, there is a shift in the group of relevant influence in a person's life; devotion to friends flourishes at this time in a person's life. As Harder (2003) states, "It is no surprise that our most significant relationships are with our peers" (p.3). This emphasis on an individual's peer group relates strongly to the sort subcategories of 'Acquaintance' and 'Intimate' in this study.

Erikson's 6th stage of development, which spans ages 18 to 35, relates to young adulthood. The predominant conflict for resolution in this stage is Intimacy versus Isolation (Erikson, 1985). While similar to the 5th stage in that our peer group continues to be of importance, the

issues of companionship and love become more eminent (Welchman, 2000). Specifically, we seek out reciprocal, satisfying relationships via dating, marriage, and friends.

If an individual successfully negotiates Erikson's 6th stage, s/he experiences intimacy on a deeper, more meaningful level (Erikson, 1985). This may include the commencement of a family, though the upper age level of this stage is subject to potential revision due to changes in American and Western societies. Conversely, if we are not successful, isolation can occur as we distance ourselves from others due to a lack of connection at a deep emotional level (Erikson, 1985). Reactions to isolation can include withdrawal from relationships as well as manipulation of others solely for our own personal gain and a burgeoning sense of superiority (Langford, 1995).

Erikson's 6th stage is important for this study for reasons similar to his 5th stage. Most of the participants fall within or near the age range for the Young Adulthood stage. Further, the emphasis placed on significant relationships with dating/marital partners and friend soundly relates to the 'Intimate' sort subgroup in this study.

A primary focus of Erikson's work involves the importance placed on social relationships and their effect on individual development. With respect to the role of sociality on individual development, Lev Vygotsky's work is also of significance. He viewed a person's development as being intertwined with his/her interaction with the surrounding culture and society.

Vygotsky states that, "Every function in the child's cultural development appears twice: first, on the social level, and later, on the individual level; first, between people (interpsychological) and then inside the child (intrapsychological)" (1978, p.57). He asserts that such processes apply to the multitude of aspects of a child's development; though Vygotsky's primary focus is on cognitive development, a more wide-ranging set of applications of his framework has occurred recently (Wertsch, 1985).

For Vygotsky, the sociocultural focus on development is pervasive; as Wertsch (1991) summarizes, "action is mediated [by] and cannot be separated from the milieu in which it is carried out" (p.18). Vygotsky divides mental functioning into higher and lower components. The latter are akin to natural mental abilities and were seen as

genetically inherited. The former, however, result directly from sociocultural interaction: "All the higher functions originate as actual relationships between individuals" (Vygotsky, 1978, p.57).

Though there are many psychological tools that mediate our mental processes (i.e., mathematics, mnemonics, maps, art, writing), language is the most essential (Vygotsky, 1987). In a view starkly similar to those in the narrative (White & Epston, 1990) and social constructionist (Gergen, 1992) camps, Vygotsky viewed language as the generative engine for our construction of reality, as the mode by which we shape and define our experiences (Cole & Wertsch, 1996). Our use of language and words extends our understanding and experiencing of events, objects, and ideas yet at the same time acts as a governor for that which we can experience, "as we can only fully experience those things that we have words for" (Nicholl, 2003, p. 3). Though Kelly's views on constructs did not achieve this level of dependence on words alone, as his views on the existence of "preverbal constructs" (1955, p.51) demonstrates, there exists a significant concordance in the importance and use of words in constructing experience between Kelly and Vygotsky. This is also an important

similarity for the purpose of this study, as well as for the use of the Repgrid as a mode of individual assessment of experience.

As indicated above, my earlier work regarding the importance of sorts in construct utilized 12 sorts (Philip, 2001). I categorized the elements that comprised these sorts into three groups. The first group of elements was referred to as the Family group, and consisted of the roles of Self, Mother, Father, and Closest Sibling. The Family group was included in the study because relationships with family members were thought to have a high level of importance and meaning to the participants (Philip, 2001).

The second group was referred to as the Acquaintance group, and consisted of the roles of Current Neighbor, Rejecting Person, Attractive Person, and Pitied Person. The Acquaintance group was selected for the study because the roles included were thought to consist of individuals whom the participant knows but may not know well (Philip, 2001). Kelly (1955) felt that clients completing the RCRI would likely define such roles with substantial conjecture about the individuals' traits.

The third and final group of the previous study was referred to as the Figure group, and consisted of the roles

of Boss, Current Teacher, Ethical Person, and Successful Person. The Figure group was included in the study due to the relative level of influence the individuals could hold over the participants, and represented figures that are engendered with distinction; however, they may not be personally well known to the participant (Philip, 2001). The variability of elements in this set is intended to serve as a governor for uniformity in roles sampled and to account for the issue of representativeness.

The sorts utilized in the previous study were comprised of elements from only one of the groups; that is, each sort contained elements from only the Family, Acquaintance, or Figure groups. This assured the same number of sorts for each group, as the elements in each group can be combined to form only 4 sorts (Philip, 2001). The restriction to one group also allowed for a more refined version of analysis; by focusing on elements from only one group, interpretation of results are less polluted by potential confounds of intergroup mixing (Philip, 2001).

Results from my earlier study did not support my original hypothesis, that meaningfulness ratings of constructs derived from sorts comprised of elements from the Family group would be significantly greater than those

derived from the Acquaintance and Figure groups. In fact, the meaningfulness ratings from the Acquaintance group were significantly greater than the Figure group and, though not at a significant level, greater than the Family group (Philip, 2001).

The current study seeks to replicate and extend results obtained in the previous study. Specifically, three primary hypotheses are advanced. First, in keeping with the results of the previous study (Philip, 2001), I hypothesize that constructs from sorts elicited from the Acquaintance group will be more meaningful than those elicited from the Figure group. The second hypothesis is related to the newly included Intimate group. Specifically, I hypothesize that constructs from the Intimates group will be more meaningful than the Figure group. Third, in keeping with the work on cognitive complexity and functionally independent constructions, I hypothesize that meaningfulness ratings will be positively correlated to FIC scores.

CHAPTER 3
METHOD

Participants

The participants were 131 (103 female and 28 male) University of Florida students drawn from undergraduate psychology courses (mean age = 20.70). Of the 131 students that indicated their ethnicity, 89 (67.9%) were Caucasian, 18 (13.7%) were of Hispanic/Latino/Latina decent, 10 (7.6%) were African-American, 7 (5.3%) were of Asian descent, and 1 (0.8%) each identified as Native American, Middle Eastern, Jewish, 'New Yorker', and 'Other.' In addition, 2 (1.5%) described themselves as biracial. Participation in the study was voluntary, with participants receiving class credit in exchange for participating in 'a study about how people view themselves and others, and how they make sense of their experiences.' The participants completed a modified version of the Role Construct Repertory Inventory (Kelly, 1955) as described below.

Instruments

The repertory test consisted of a 16 x 16 ratings grid (Neimeyer & Neimeyer, 1981). The test required participants to complete tasks in sequential order (see

Appendices B & C for versions of the instructional sets). First, they were asked to complete a Role Title List by writing the name of 16 people who corresponded to particular roles [i.e., 'Father, or if you do not have a father, the person who best fits this description to you' or 'Current neighbor'(see Appendix D for Role Title List)]. Next, they were asked to consider a sort; to reiterate, this is a grouping of three of the aforementioned people. Using Kelly's triadic difference method (Epting et al, 1971), participants were asked to describe how any two of those three people were alike (the construct pole) and at the same time, different from the third.

After arriving upon this similarity, they were asked to describe how the third person was different (the contrast pole). Then, participants were asked to rate each of the 16 people on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from -3 to +3, where -3 corresponded to being very much like the contrast pole and +3 corresponded to being very much like the construct pole. Finally, after completing all 16 sorts, the participants were asked to 'rate each construct from 1 (not meaningful) to 10 (extremely meaningful) in terms of how meaningful it is to you.' Meaningfulness was

operationalized as being useful or central to the person in their life and in their relationships with others.

To assess potential order effects, I used two different forms of the grid. Both forms of the grid were comprised of the same sorts, though the order of presentation of the sorts was varied. Specifically, the order of the sorts was reverse-halved, with the first 8 sorts for Grid 1 representing the second 8 sorts for Grid 2 and the second 8 sorts of Grid 1 representing the first 8 sorts of Grid 2 (see Appendices E & F for versions of Grid 1 and Grid 2). Both Grid 1 and Grid 2 contained sorts comprised of elements from only one subgroup of elements; that is, all elements were solely from Acquaintance, Family, Figure, or Intimate subgroups.

Procedure

Two separate designs were employed to analyze the meaningfulness ratings in this study. The first design was a 2 (male vs. female) X 2 (grid form 1 vs. grid form 2) X 4 (Family vs. Acquaintance vs. Figure vs. Intimate subgroups) repeated measure design. The second design was a 2 X 2 X 16 (each individual sort) repeated measure design. A repeated measure design was utilized for this study, as the measure included both between- and within-subject variables

and the number of measurements far exceeded the number of subjects (Personal communication with Dr. James Booth, May 3, 2002; Sprinthall, 2003).

Participants were randomly assigned to either the Grid 1 or Grid 2 condition. All participants were presented the same instructions, including an example demonstration by the researchers, with one variation dependent upon grid form. The example elicitation for participants completing Grid 1 involved the use of a sort from the Family subgroup (specifically with elements 1, 2, and 3); the example elicitation for participants completing Grid 2 involved the use of a sort from the Figure subgroup (specifically with elements 14, 15, and 16). The participants' meaningfulness ratings served as the dependent variable in the study.

The participants' FIC scores were calculated using the statistical package PCGrid (Metzler & Magargal, 1993), based on an adaptation of Landfield's (1971) work. After computation of the FIC scores, a correlation was conducted between participants' FIC scores and meaningfulness ratings.

CHAPTER 4
RESULTS

Results of the 2 (gender) X 2 (grid type) X 4 (group) repeated measure design did not yield any significant results. Contrary to the aforementioned hypotheses, there were no significant differences between any of the mean combined meaningfulness ratings for the four subgroups of elements [$F(3,360) = 1.787$, $p = .149$]. In looking at the means for the four subgroups, however, a general trend toward the aforementioned hypotheses was evident. Specifically, the mean combined meaningfulness rating for the Intimate subgroup was the greatest ($M = 28.43$), followed by Family ($M = 27.17$), Acquaintance ($M = 26.44$), and Figure ($M = 26.40$), respectively. Unlike my previous study (Philip, 2001), the mean combined meaningfulness rating for the Acquaintance group was not significantly greater than for the Figure group and was actually smaller than the mean combined meaningfulness rating for the Family group.

Results of the 2 X 2 X 16 (sort) repeated measure design revealed a main effect for sort [$F(15, 1800) = 1.677$, $p = .049$]. Follow up comparisons using Tukey's HSD

method (α = .05) revealed differences between Sort 9 (M = 7.16) and Sort 3 (M = 6.20) as well as between Sort 12 (M = 7.16) and Sort 3 (M = 6.20). All other analyses conducted for the main effect were not significant.

An interaction effect for grid type and sort [F (15, 1800) = 2.101, p = .008]. Follow up comparisons using Tukey's HSD method (α = .05) revealed several significant differences in mean rating of meaningfulness: Sort 1 was significantly higher in grid form 1 (M = 7.40) than in grid form 2 (M = 5.68), Sort 4 was significantly higher in grid form 1 (M = 7.55) than in grid form 2 (M = 6.44), Sort 5 was significantly higher in grid form 1 (M = 7.64) than in grid form 2 (M = 6.67), and Sort 10 was significantly higher in grid form 2 (7.61) than in grid form 1 (6.31). All other analyses conducted for the interaction between grid type and sort as well as all other analyses for the overall 2 X 2 X 16 design were not significant.

Results of the Pearson Product Moment Correlation for meaningfulness ratings and FIC scores were significant. However, the direction of the effect was the opposite as hypothesized, with a resultant negative correlation (r = -.189, p = .036).

CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION

The results of the study generally do not provide support for the aforementioned hypotheses. Concerning the first hypothesis, there were insufficient findings to support the contention that meaningfulness ratings for the Acquaintance group were larger than meaningfulness ratings for the Figure group. Though there was a trend toward such a finding, the difference was negligible and the results did not reach the level of significance.

One possible interpretation as to the lack of replication from my previous work involves the inclusion of the Intimate group. As previously indicated, Erikson (1985) asserted that the role of intimate companions, both romantic and platonic in nature, becomes more pronounced in a young adult's life. Such a change in influence from primarily a peer group to intimate companions starts approximately at the age of 18 (Erikson, 1985). As the average age in this study was over 20 years, it may be that such an alteration in the primary group of influence had already occurred for many of the participants, resulting in

a less significant difference in meaningfulness ratings between the Acquaintance and Figure groups.

There is another interpretation regarding the lack of significant findings for the first hypothesis that may also stem from the inclusion of the Intimate group. Though the primary group of influence for many of the participants may have changed or be in the process of changing from peers to intimates, the influence of peers cannot be eliminated. There may be significant cognitive overlap between the two groupings, resulting in less differentiation among ratings. In other words, given the relatively new or ongoing change in primary groups of influence, there may be less distinction amongst the components of such groups.

Concerning the second hypothesis, there were insufficient findings to support the contention that meaningfulness ratings for the Intimate group were larger than meaningfulness ratings for the Figure group. Again, there was a trend toward such a finding; though the difference was substantially greater than between Acquaintance and Figure groups, the results still failed to reach a statistically significant level.

Similar to the aforementioned interpretation for the Acquaintance group, it may be that the cognitive overlap

between Intimate and Acquaintance groups altered the results for the Intimate group. There may also be role overlap, in that people in one Intimate role (ex., ex-partner) may be very similar to someone in one Acquaintance role (ex., person who you believe dislikes you). Though specific people were not repeated as elements, it could be that people in those roles represent very similar entities.

For example, a participant may put the name of an ex-partner (though not the one in the "ex-partner" role) in the role of "person who you believe dislikes you." As such, they may represent similar roles in the participant's life while functioning as different roles in the experiment. Though this event could be true for all participants, it is possible that this confound is more pertinent for this age group of participants.

The main effect difference between Sort 12 and Sort 3 was not part of an hypothesis. However, this finding is consistent with the second hypothesis, as Sort 12 is a sort from the Intimate group (comprised of the elements Current Partner/Spouse, Ex-Partner/Spouse, and Ex-Best/Closest Friend) while Sort 3 represents the Figure group (Most Successful Person, Liked Teacher, and Most Ethical Person). In reviewing the component elements of each sort, it is

evident that Sort 12 contains two elements that may be considered negatively valenced, namely Ex-Partner and Ex-Best Friend, while Sort 3 does not contain any negatively valenced elements. The inclusion of negative elements, coupled with the meaningfulness of the roles contained in Sort 12, may account for the difference between the two sorts.

The main effect difference between Sort 9 and Sort 3 was not part of an hypothesis, and is not only unexpected but also intriguing. Sort 12 is a sort from the Figure group (composed of the role titles of Most Successful Person, Liked Teacher, and Disliked Teacher) and Sort 3 is another sort from the Figure group (Most Successful Person, Liked Teacher, and Most Ethical Person). Similar to Sort 12, Sort 9 contains one element that may be considered negatively valenced, Disliked Teacher. It is possible that the inclusion of a negatively valenced item in conjunction with the overlap in presentation of those other two elements specifically, may account for the differences between Sorts 9 and 3. Future research should further investigate such findings as well as the meaningfulness of the component elements in the Figure subgroup.

The interaction effect and resultant difference in Sort 1 between Grid 1 and Grid 2 administrations is intriguing, as there was no such effect in my earlier work (Philip, 2001). Though the Repgrids administered were different than those in this study, it is possible that the inclusion of the Intimate groups in this study acted as a 'primer' for ratings of meaningfulness. This becomes more feasible when recalling that the meaningfulness ratings were carried out only after all of the internal ratings of each element on each construct was completed.

Additionally, it is interesting to note that three of the groups of elements were represented in the interaction follow up tests. Specifically, Sorts 1 and 10 were from the Family group, Sort 4 was from the Acquaintance group, and Sort 5 was from the Intimate group. Though there was not a main effect amongst the groups of elements, it appears that the effect of grid administration was a substantial factor in grid completion.

Further, with respect to Sorts 1 and 10, the order of presentation of Sort 1 may have affected the eventual ratings in the different Repgrid versions. In Grid 1, Sort 1 was the first sort presented while Sort 10 was the tenth; in Grid 2, Sort 1 was the ninth and Sort 10 was the second.

Such a difference in order of presentation may result in greater ratings for these sorts. As well, both sorts are from the Family group and contain two mutual elements (Mother and Father). The overlap of elements coupled with the early administration may serve as an explanation for the differences; it may be that elements containing both parental figures, when presented as an early sort, prime the respondent to arrive upon more meaningful constructs. However, such explanations were not true for the administrations in my earlier work (Philip, 2001), and current results may simply be an artifact of this administration.

Another reason for the lack of support for the hypotheses may lie in the construction of the sorts. The sorts included in this study were comprised of elements from one group. Elements in a particular group may be perceived as having similar characteristics in many ways. This similarity may result in a restriction in the distinctions made between the elements, consequently acting as a governor for the meaningfulness of the constructs elicited.

On the surface, the negative correlation between FIC scores and meaningfulness ratings seems perplexing and

counterintuitive. However, a more refined analysis of the method of computing FIC scores yields an interpretation of these results. When calculating FIC scores, the inclusion of '00' scores can artificially inflate the overall FIC score of a particular grid; in essence, the occurrence of '00' values indicate independence amongst constructs (Landfield, 1971; Personal communication with Dr. Greg Neimeyer, June 16, 2003). Consequently, given that '00' scores accounted for approximately 11% of the total internal grid responses, FIC scores could have been significantly effected by such scores.

With respect to clarifying the issue of meaningfulness from internal Repgrid data, future research should investigate meaningfulness via calculating the use of extremity scores. Essentially, extremity ratings represent the percentage of extreme ratings, with higher scores reflecting greater meaning (Adams-Webber, 1979). O'Donovan (1965) advocated for the use of extremity scores as an indication of meaningfulness in an attempt to account for the discrepancy between studies linking extreme ratings to pathology with those studies linking extreme ratings to more adaptive behavior. Given that idea has been supported by research from various sources (Adams-Webber, 1979;

Bonarius, 1971; Isaacson & Landfield, 1965; Metzler & Neimeyer, 1988), use of extremity ratings to assess meaningfulness is advised.

Future research should also address the discrepancies between the results of my earlier study (Philip, 2001) and the current study. Specifically, an investigation into the replication of results for either study should be conducted to establish a trend in response. Such follow up should address the potential confounds of Intimate and Acquaintance groups, and may include adaptation of the element sets. Further, the co-mingling of elements from different sets should be investigated to assess their meaningfulness.

One potential application for such research involves increased validity in the use of the Repgrid. Though representativeness of elements is crucial element in elicitation (Kelly, 1955), identifying sorts that yield more meaningful constructs could aid researchers in focusing on discrepancies of meaningfulness inherent in elicited constructs. This could be of particular use for investigators who are looking for aspects specific to one specific element set (i.e., Family).

A second application of this research is in the field of therapy. I envision the use of sorts as an intervention during the counseling process. Specifically, I believe that identifying sorts that generate more meaningful constructs can be beneficial in two primary ways. First, it can help clients who become 'stuck' in therapy by helping them look at the conflicts in their life in a different manner. Second, it can assist clients in honing in on the more central, core issues when faced with a multitude of difficulties. It is my hope that current and future research in this arena can ameliorate these areas for psychologists.

APPENDIX A

CATEGORIES OF ELEMENTS FROM KELLY'S EXAMPLE PROTOCOL

SELF

1. Self

FAMILY

2. Mother
3. Father
4. Brother
5. Sister

INTIMATES

6. Spouse
7. Ex-flame
8. Pal
9. Ex-pal

SITUATIONALS

10. Minister
11. Physician
12. Neighbor

VALENCIES

13. Rejecting Person
14. Pitied Person
15. Threatening Person
16. Attractive Person

AUTHORITIES

17. Accepted Teacher
18. Rejected Teacher
19. Boss

VALUES

20. Successful Person
21. Happy Person
22. Ethical Person

(Kelly, 1955, p. 273)

APPENDIX B
INSTRUCTIONS FOR GRID 1

ROLE CONSTRUCT REPERTORY INVENTORY

AGE: _____ MALE _____ FEMALE _____
ETHNICITY_____

INSTRUCTIONS

This inventory is designed to help the examiner understand you and some of the people who have played a part in your life.

1. Turn to the next page, entitled "Role Title List." Beginning with your own name write the first names of the persons described in the corresponding blanks on the third page. For example, for Role Title #1, you would write your name in the slot marked "1. _____" on the third page. If you cannot remember a person's name, write a last name or something about that person which will clearly bring to your mind the person's identity. PLEASE DO NOT USE ANY NAME MORE THAN ONCE.

2. After completing all 16 names, turn to the third page. Note that for the first row, the names corresponding to role titles 1, 2, and 3 (Self, Mother, and Father) have circles in them. Think about these three people. Are two of them alike in some meaningful way that distinguishes them from the third person? Keep thinking about those three people until you remember the meaningful way in which two of them are alike and different from the third.
   - When you have decided which two people are alike, put an "X" in the two circles corresponding to the two people that are alike. Do not put any marks in the third circle.
   - Now write the word or phrase that tells how these two people are alike in the space to the right of the circles labeled "Construct."
   - Next, write the word or phrase that explains how the third person is different from the other two people in the space to the right of the circles labeled "Contrast."

3. Now, consider all 16 of the people whose names you came up with for the "Role Title List" (including the three people you just looked at). Please rate each of the 16 people on a scale of -3 to +3 with regard to the idea you just came up with; -3

would correspond to being very much like the "Contrast" while +3 would correspond to being very much like the "Construct."

4. Then, complete the rest of the inventory in the same way you did the first row (Repeat steps 2 and 3 for each row). PLEASE DO NOT REPEAT ANY CONSTRUCTS.

5. Finally, after you have completed all 16 rows, please go back and look at each of the Construct-Contrast ideas again. In the column marked "Rating", please rate each construct from 1 (not meaningful) to 10 (extremely meaningful) in terms of how meaningful it is to you. In other words, how central or useful is it to you in your life and your relationships. Please repeat this for all 16 Construct-Contrast ideas.

6. Thanks, you've completed the Role Construct Repertory Inventory ☺

APPENDIX C
INSTRUCTIONS FOR GRID 2

ROLE CONSTRUCT REPERTORY INVENTORY

AGE: _____ MALE _____ FEMALE _____
ETHNICITY_____

INSTRUCTIONS

This inventory is designed to help the examiner understand you and some of the people who have played a part in your life.

1. Turn to the next page, entitled "Role Title List." Beginning with your own name write the first names of the persons described in the corresponding blanks on the third page. For example, for Role Title #1, you would write your name in the slot marked "1. _____" on the third page. If you cannot remember a person's name, write a last name or something about that person which will clearly bring to your mind the person's identity. PLEASE DO NOT USE ANY NAME MORE THAN ONCE.

2. After completing all 16 names, turn to the third page. Note that for the first row, the names corresponding to role titles 14, 15, and 16 (Teacher you liked, Teacher you didn't like, and Most Ethical Person you know) have circles in them. Think about these three people. Are two of them alike in some meaningful way that distinguishes them from the third person? Keep thinking about those three people until you remember the meaningful way in which two of them are alike and different from the third.
   - When you have decided which two people are alike, put an "X" in the two circles corresponding to the two people that are alike. Do not put any marks in the third circle.
   - Now write the word or phrase that tells how these two people are alike in the space to the right of the circles labeled "Construct."
   - Next, write the word or phrase that explains how the third person is different from the other two people in the space to the right of the circles labeled "Contrast."

3. Now, consider all 16 of the people whose names you came up with for the "Role Title List" (including the three people you just looked at). Please rate each of the 16 people on a scale of -3 to +3 with regard to the idea you just came up with; -3

would correspond to being very much like the "Contrast" while +3 would correspond to being very much like the "Construct."

4. Then, complete the rest of the inventory in the same way you did the first row (Repeat steps 2 and 3 for each row). PLEASE DO NOT REPEAT ANY CONSTRUCTS.

5. Finally, after you have completed all 16 rows, please go back and look at each of the Construct-Contrast ideas again. In the column marked "Rating", please rate each construct from 1 (not meaningful) to 10 (extremely meaningful) in terms of how meaningful it is to you. In other words, how central or useful is it to you in your life and your relationships. Please repeat this for all 16 Construct-Contrast ideas.

6. Thanks, you've completed the Role Construct Repertory Inventory ☺

APPENDIX D
ROLE TITLE LIST

1. Your name

2. Your mother's name (or, if you do not have a mother, the name of the person who best fits this description to you)

3. Your father's name (or, if you do not have a father, the name of the person who best fits this description to you)

4. The relative with whom you feel least close or connected

5. Current partner/spouse (or, if you do not have a current partner/spouse, the person who best fits this description to you)

6. Ex-partner/spouse (or, if you do not have an ex-partner/spouse, the person who best fits this description to you)

7. Current best or closest friend

8. Ex-best/closest friend

9. A current neighbor (or, if you do not have any neighbors, a recent neighbor)

10. A person whom you know who you believe dislikes you

11. A person whom you would like to know better

12. The person to whom you would most like to be of help

13. The most successful person you know

14. A teacher or professor you liked (or the teacher/professor of a subject you liked)

15. A teacher or professor you didn't like (or the teacher/professor of subject you didn't like)

16. The most ethical person you know

APPENDIX E
ROLE CONSTRUCT REPERTORY INVENTORY, GRID VERSION 1

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	Construct Pole	Contrast Pole	Rating
1	O	O	O		O		O	O											
2																			
3																			
4																			
5																			
6	O			O	O	O	O												
7			O	O															
8						O	O	O											
9																			
10		O	O	O	O				O										
11																			
12					O	O		O											
13																			
14	O	O		O															
15																			
16																			

APPENDIX F

ROLE CONSTRUCT REPERTORY INVENTORY, GRID VERSION 2

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	Construct Pole	Contrast Pole	Rating
1															O	O			
2		O	O	O											O	O			
3		O	O	O								O							
4					O	O		O				O							
5					O								O	O	O	O			
6		O	O		O								O						
7									O	O	O								
8													O		O	O			
9		O	O	O															
10					O		O	O								O			
11													O	O					
12										O	O	O							
13					O	O	O												
14	O		O	O															
15									O	O		O							
16						O	O	O											

REFERENCES

Adams-Webber, J.R. (1979). Construing persons in social contexts. In P. Stringer & D. Bannister (Eds.), *Constructs of sociality and individuality* (pp. 195-200). London: Academic Press.

Adams-Webber, J.R. (1998). Differentiation and sociality in terms of elicited and provided constructs. *Psychological Science, 9,* 499-501.

Bannister, D. (1985). Foreword. In N. Beail (Ed.), *Repertory grid technique and personal constructs: Applications in clinical and educational settings*(pp. xi-xiii). Cambridge, MA: Brookline Books.

Bell, R., Vince, J., and Costigan, J. (1999). *Which is more important in repertory grid data: Constructs or elements?* Paper presented at the Thirteenth International Congress on Personal Construct Psychology, Berlin, July, 1999.

Bieri, J. (1955). Cognitive complexity-simplicity and predictive behavior. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 51,* 263-268.

Bieri, J. (1961). Complexity-simplicity as a personality variable in cognitive and preferential behavior. In D. W. Fiske and S. R. Maddi (Eds.), *Functions of varied experience* (pp. 355-379). Homewood, IL: Dorsey Press, Inc.

Bonarius, J. C. J. (1971). *Personal construct psychology and extreme response style: An interaction model of meaningfulness, maladjustment, and communication.* Amsterdam: Swets & Zeitlinger.

Caputi, P., & Reddy, P. (1999). A comparison of triadic and dyadic methods of personal construct elicitation. *Journal of Constructivist Psychology, 12,* 253-264.

Cole, M., & Wertsch, J. V. (1996). Beyond the individual - Social antimony in discussions of Piaget and Vygotsky. *Human Development, 39*(5), 250-256.

Epting, F. R. (1984). *Personal construct counseling and psychotherapy.* Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.

Epting, F.R., Probert, J.S., & Pittman, S.D. (1993). Alternative strategies for construct elicitation: Experimenting with experience. *International Journal of Personal Construct Psychology, 6,* 79-98.

Epting, F. R., Suchman, D. I., & Nickeson, K. J. (1971). An evaluation of elicitation procedures for personal constructs. *British Journal of Psychology, 62,* 513-517.

Erikson, E. H. (1985). *Childhood and society* (3rd Ed.). New York: W. W. Norton.

Fransella, F. (1995). *Key figures in counselling and psychotherapy: George Kelly.* London: Sage Publications.

Fransella, F. & Bannister, D. (1977). *A manual for repertory grid technique.* New York: Academic Press.

Gergen, K. J., & Kaye, J. (1992). Beyond narrative in the negotiation of therapeutic meaning. In S. McNamee and K. J. Gergen (Eds.), *Therapy as a social construction: Inquiries into social construction* (pp. 166-185). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Gross, Jr., F. L. (1987). *Introducing Erik Erikson: An invitation to his thinking.* Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Harder, A. F. (2002). *The developmental stages of Erik Erikson* [On-line]. Available: http://www.learningplaceonline.com/stages/organize/Erikson.htm. Last accessed: June 2, 2003.

Holbrook, K. & Caskey, B. J. (2000). *Stand! Life-span development: Contending ideas and opinions.* Frostburg, MD: Frostburg Press.

Kelly, G. A. (1955). *The psychology of personal constructs.* New York: Norton.

Kitchener, R. F. (1996). The nature of the social for Piaget and Vygotsky. *Human Development, 39*(5), 243-249.

Landfield, A.W. (1971). *Personal construct systems in psychotherapy.* Chicago: Rand McNally.

Landfield, A.W., Stefan, R., & Dempsey, D. (1990). Single and multiple self implications for change grids: Studies of consistency. *International Journal of Personal Construct Psychology, 3,* 423-436.

Langford, P. E. (1995). *Approaches to the development of moral reasoning.* Hillsdale, CA: L. Erlbaum Associates.

Leitner, L.M. (1985). Interview methodologies for construct elicitation: Searching for the core. In F.R. Epting & A.W. Landfield (Eds.), *Anticipating personal construct psychology* (pp. 293-305). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Metzler, A. E., & Magargal, L. (1993). PCGRID (Version 1.0)[Computer software]. Bethlehem, PA: Authors.

Metzler, A. E., & Neimeyer, G. J. (1988). Vocational hierarchies: How do we count the ways? *International Journal of Personal Construct Psychology, 1,* 205-218.

Mitsos, S. B. (1958). Representative elements in role construct technique. *Journal of Consulting Psychology, 22,* 311-313.

Moore, M. A., & Neimeyer, G. J. (1992). Using occupational information to increase vocational differentiation. *Journal of Career Development, 19,* 3-12.

Moore, M. A., & Neimeyer, G. J. (1997). Personally meaning and vocational differentiation: Reversing the decrement effect. *Journal of Career Development, 24,* 83-94.

Moore, M. A., Neimeyer, G. J., & Marmarosh, C. (1992). The effects of informational valence and occupational favorability on vocational differentiation: A test of the disconfirmation hypothesis. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 39*, 335-341.

Neimeyer, G. J., Leso, J. F., Marmarosh, C., Prichard, S., & Moore, M. A. (1992). The role of construct type in vocational differentiation: The use of elicited vs. provided dimensions. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 39*, 121-128.

Neimeyer, G. J., & Neimeyer, R. A. (1981). Personal construct perspectives on cognitive assessment. In T. Merluzzi, C. Glass, & M. Genest (Eds.), *Cognitive assessment* (pp. 188-232). New York: The Guilford Press.

Neimeyer, G. J., Neimeyer, R. A., Hagans, C. L., & Van Brunt, D. L. (2002). Is there madness in our method? The effects of repertory grid variations on measures of construct system structure. In R. Neimeyer and G. Neimeyer (Eds.), *Advances in personal construct psychology: New directions and perspectives* (pp. 161-200). Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers/Greenwood Publishing Group, Inc.

Neimeyer, R. A. (1995). Constructivist psychotherapies: Features, foundations, and future directions. In R. A. Neimeyer & M. J. Mahoney (Eds.), *Constructivism in psychotherapy* (pp. 11-38). Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.

Neimeyer, R. A., & Mahoney, M. J. (1995). *Constructivism in psychotherapy*. Washington, D. C.: American Psychological Association.

Neimeyer, R. A., & Neimeyer, G. A. (2002). *Advances in personal construct psychology: New directions and perspectives*. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers/Greenwood Publishing Group, Inc.

Nicholl, T. (2003). *Vygotsky* [On-line]. Available: http://www.massey.ac.nz/~alock/virtual.trishvyg.htm. Last accessed: June 2, 2003.

O'Donovan, D. (1965). Rating extremity: Pathology or meaningfulness? *Psychological Review, 72*(5), 358-372.

Parr, J., & Neimeyer, G.J. (1994). Effects of gender, construct type, occupational information and career relevance on vocational differentiation. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 41*, 27-33.

Philip, D. M. (2001). *A preliminary investigation into the meaningfulness of sorts in the creation of constructs.* Unpublished master's project, University of Florida.

Sprinthall, R. C. (2003). *Basic Statistical Analyses* (7th Ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Stringer, P. (1979). Individuals, roles, and persons. In P. Stringer & D. Bannister (Eds.), *Constructs of sociality and individuality* (pp. 91-112). New York: Academic Press.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1987) *The collected works of L.S. Vygotsky: Vol.1, Problems of general psychology.* New York: Plenum Press.

Welchman, K. (2000). *Erik Erikson: His life, work, and significance.* Philadelphia: Open University Press.

Wertsch, J. V. (1985). *Culture, communication, and cognition: Vygotskian perspectives.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wertsch, J. V. (1991). *Voices of the mind: A sociocultural approach to mediated action.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

White, M., & Epston, D. (1990). *Narrative means to therapeutic ends.* New York: W. W. Norton.

Wigfield, A., Eccles, J. S., & Pintrich, P. R. (1996). Development between the ages of 11 and 25. In D. Berliner & R. Calfee (Eds.), *Handbook of Educational Psychology* (pp. 148-185). New York: Macmillan.

Winter, D. A. (1992). *Personal construct psychology in clinical practice: Theory, research, and applications.* London: Routledge.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Danny Philip was born in Santa Monica, California, in March 1970. He and his family moved to South Florida in February 1973, spending one year in Miami and then moving to Broward County. Danny was raised in the towns of Davie and Fort Lauderdale and attended only one school, The University School of Nova University, from kindergarten through his senior year in high school. He attended the University of Florida for his undergraduate work, beginning in August 1987 and graduating in May 1991. Danny worked in the field of social services for four years before returning to graduate school in the Counselor Education Department at the University of Florida in August 1995. He completed work on his Ed.S. and M.Ed. through counselor education in August 1998 and began work on his Ph.D. in the counseling psychology program at that time. He has great parents, wonderful friends, and a marvelous, slobbery dog named Elsa.

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Franz Epting, Chair
Professor of Psychology

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Greg Neimeyer
Professor of Psychology

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Robert Ziller
Professor of Psychology

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Peter Giacobbi
Assistant Professor of
Exercise and Sport
Sciences

This dissertation was submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the Department of Psychology in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences and to the Graduate School and was accepted as partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

August 2003

_____

Dean, Graduate School